

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 12, 2003. Claims 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 58, and 59 are pending in this application.

Claims 22, 24 and 58 were amended to clarify that the logic control unit includes executable coding that corresponds to a process of coating a wafer.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 58, and 59 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The rejection indicates that the subject matter recited in the claims is not sufficiently described in the specification, and that certain recitations in the claims are not found in the specification. Applicant is not aware of a requirement that the specification shall contain the same recitation of language as used in the claims. Applicant submits that the recited claimed subject matter is included in the specification in such a manner as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons indicated below.

The specification teaches track coating unit logic containing a recipe executed by the logic unit, and that the recipe contains binary coding. *See*, specification page 9, lines 14-19. Applicant respectfully submits that a logic unit executing a recipe containing binary code includes a logic control unit as recited in the several claims. Also, executing a recipe that contains binary coding includes executing coding to perform a process or a method. Such a process or method is disclosed in the specification on page 10 line 11 through page 11 line 15.

Also, regarding claims 22 and 24, the specification teaches a process that includes spinning the wafer (*see, e.g.* process steps 440 and 460 discussed on pages 10 and 11 of the specification).

Regarding claim 26, the specification teaches a process that includes the third nozzle dispensing solvent at the center on the wafer top surface and spinning the wafer until the solvent is distributed across the wafer surface (*See* page 10 lines 13-19 of the specification).

Regarding claim 27, the specification teaches a process that includes dispensing photo resist on the wafer and spinning to distribute the photo resist (*See* page 10 lines 24-27 of the specification).

Regarding claims 58 and 59, the specification teaches the elements of a logic control unit executing a process dispensing the solvent and resist as discussed above on pages 9-11 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 58, and 59.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 58, and 59 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (Figure 1, and page 9, lines 9-19), and further in view of Orth (U.S. Patent No. 5,750,317, “Orth”), Gordon (U.S. Patent No. 5,066,616, “Gordon”), and Yoda et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,876,882, “Yoda”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested in the prior art. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

As noted above, claims 22, 24 and 58 were amended to clarify that the logic control unit includes coding to perform the recited process, and that the recited process is not merely an intended use. Insofar as the rejection is applied to the amended claims, Applicant is unable to find a showing or suggestion of such coding to perform the recited process in the cited portions of the Orth, Gordon, and Yoda references, and the admitted prior art. Additional grounds for traversal of the rejection are included below for appropriate groupings of the claims.

Regarding claim 22:

Applicant is unable to find, in the cited portions of the Orth, Gordon, and Yoda references, and the admitted prior art, among other things, a suggestion of the solvent head including a first nozzle directed at the side of the wafer, a second nozzle directed at the back surface of the wafer and a third nozzle directed at a center of the front surface of the wafer, and a suggestion of a logic control unit including the coding, as recited in the claim. Also, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, the prior art must suggest the desirability of the claimed invention. M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. Applicant is unable to find, in the cited portions of the

Orth, Gordon, and Yoda references, and the admitted prior art, a suggestion or incentive to combine the references.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 22.

Regarding claims 24, 26, 27, 29 and 31:

Applicant is unable to find in the cited portions of the Orth, Gordon and Yoda references, and the admitted prior art, among other things, a suggestion of the solvent head including a first nozzle directed at the side of the wafer, a second nozzle directed at the back surface of the wafer and a third nozzle directed at a center of the front surface of the wafer, and a suggestion of a logic control unit including the coding, as recited in claim 24. As discussed previously, the three-nozzle head arrangement in the present application eliminates the extra steps of moving the nozzles to the desired position to dispense the materials.

Also, Applicant is unable to find in the cited portions of the Orth, Gordon and Yoda references, and the admitted prior art, a suggestion of a process using the three-nozzle head arrangement that includes distributing the photo resist solution on the wafer using the first and second nozzles, as arranged, upon distributing the solvent with the third nozzle, as recited in claim 24.

Further, claims 26, 27, 29 and 31 depend on claim 24 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated for claim 24.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 24, 26, 27, 29 and 31.

Regarding claims 58 and 59:

Applicant is unable to find in the cited portions of the Orth, Gordon and Yoda references, and the admitted prior art, among other things, a suggestion of a third nozzle and a logic control unit including coding, as recited in claim 58. Claim 59 depends on claim 58 and is believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated for claim 58.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6960 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN WHITMAN

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402

(612) 373-6960

Date 11-12-03

By M L R

Marvin L. Beekman

Reg. No. 38,377

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 12 day of November, 2003.

Tina Kohout

Name

Z. L. R.

Signature